

REMARKS

1. Informalities

Claim Cancellation. Allowable claim 22 has been cancelled from the application and its subject matter included in independent claim 21.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, applicant has amended claim 21 to include the limitation of a “sleeve.” As such, applicant submits that there is proper antecedent basis for claim 23 in claim 21.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21, 25-27 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 1,111,489 (hereinafter referred to as “Palmer”).

In response, applicant has amended independent claim 21 to include the subject matter of allowable claim 22. As such, applicant submits that this claim is now allowable over Palmer, and that Palmer does not anticipate independent claim 21 of the application.

Dependent claims 25-27 place further limitations on what is otherwise argued allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims stand in a condition for allowance.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Palmer does not anticipate any of the claims of the present invention. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn from consideration.

4. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer. In response, applicant has amended independent claim 21 to include the subject matter of allowable claim 22. Claims 24 and 30 further limit what is argued as allowable subject matter in claim 21, and therefore are not rendered obvious by Palmer.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the prior art does not render the claims of the present invention obvious, particularly as amended to recite more specific and definite limitations. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the claims of the application be

reconsidered and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the deficiencies in the application have been corrected and that the proposed claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art references cited by the Examiner. As such, Applicant believes that the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

If any impediments to the allowance of this application for patent remain after the above amendments and remarks are entered, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned attorney of record.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 20-0100.

DATED this 14th day of June, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

THORPE, NORTH, & WESTERN, LLP



Christopher L. Johnson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,809

THORPE, NORTH, & WESTERN, LLP
8180 S. 700 E., Suite 350
Sandy, Utah 84070
(801) 566-6633 telephone
(801) 566-0750 facsimile

CLJ:tls

\\Tnwmain\Common\FILES\ProLaw numbered files\01900\01900-22873\Office Action\25240.doc